

was a third one planned, which for some reason did not materialize, also in the eastern part of Africa.

To say that once again, that as bad as we feel when these types of events happen and as much as we wish that we did not have to deal with them, the fact is that we do have to deal with these instances.

As the chairman of a group of Republicans, I am joined here today by the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) who is also a member of the group of Republicans which calls ourselves the Task Force on Terrorism and U.N. Conventional Warfare.

We have studied these types of activities. We have studied the causes of them and we have, sadly, become too aware that our government as an institution is either unable or unwilling to put in place policies to deal with them. I would like to think that we have been unwilling rather than unable.

Let me just recite one example of the kind of thing that leads me to that conclusion. In 1996, we passed the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of that year. Among other things, it provided that victims of terrorism and their families could sue States who sponsor terrorism.

In the case of one individual who was killed, it happened to be in Gaza in the West Bank, a young lady by the name of Alysa Flatow, who was an American citizen studying in Israel, was killed by a car bomb. It sounds familiar.

Pursuant to the act that we passed in 1996, her family had the right to sue in American courts to recover damages which they did, and they were granted a judgment by the judge in U.S. District Court here in Washington, D.C., a judgment for \$247 million against the State of Iran who, through various accounts, had transferred monies to the Islamic Jihad who carried out this attack.

Here on the floor this week, and 2 weeks ago, members of the Task Force on Terrorism had to fight against the State Department to pass another amendment to another law to enable the Flatow family to collect their judgment.

In other words, our State Department and our Justice Department was fighting against our efforts to help the Flatow family cause a price to be paid by Iran, the sponsor of this terrorist act. In other words, our government was protecting the rights of the State of Iran rather than the rights of the Flatow family and the rights of every Member of this House who voted for the Antiterrorism Act of 1996.

There has to be a price to pay. Ronald Reagan knew there had to be a price to pay. He told Qadhafi that there would be a price to pay, and there was a price to pay. The Libyans have been silent ever since on these subjects.

Our State Department must take note that, in the case of Khobar Tours, there was no price to pay. In the case of these two latest explosions, we will go through the process of grieving. We

will go through the process of cleaning up the embassies. We will go through the process of some kind of a cursory investigation.

Unless our policies change, there will be no price to pay. Those who cause these types of actions must know that there is not only a price to pay, but that America will cause a heavy price to be paid.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding to me. I want to thank him first for being the Chairman of the Task Force on Terrorism and U.N. Conventional Warfare. I know he has got a lot of things to do as a member of the Committee on National Security and chairman of the Joint Economic Committee. But this is a very important area.

I agree with the gentleman very strongly that, when we have a State-sponsored terrorism where assets and resources are funneled to terrorists to kill people around the world, in many cases Americans, it only makes sense to deter that type of State action, whether it is Iraq or Iran or Libya or others, to deter those States from putting the full force and effect of their State treasury into terrorist activities.

The way we do that is by hitting them in the pocketbook. That means when we have a judgment, taking assets; that means freezing assets where you can; that means hurting them economically around the world.

We do need to have the full cooperation of our own State Department to do that. That is really the only way we can establish a policy of deterrence.

HUMAN INTELLIGENCE IS IMPORTANT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, it is important, obviously, to have what is called human intelligence. That is, when a group of terrorists are planning to bomb an embassy or do something else that takes life and property, it is good to know ahead of time what is going to happen, because this is not a big military operation where, by national technical means, that means by satellite overheads and other things, we can see large events developing, like tanks massing for an attack and other things that would indicate a large movement of a military force.

But in this case, an attack may be promulgated by a small group of people, meeting in a small room somewhere. It is important for us to have human intelligence, to have a person who sees that group or a person who sits in with that group or a person who knows what that group is doing to report to us so we can stop that terrorist act.

Having a large human intelligence capability requires a lot of funding. It

requires money. It is expensive to have good intelligence. I think that one of the things that we are going to have to realize as we move from the Cold War into this new era, an era that I would call the era of terrorism and State-sponsored terrorism in many cases, is that we are going to have to meet this age of terrorism with a lot of investment in human intelligence along with national technical means.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask my colleague, who is really an expert in terrorism, for his views. I yield to my friend from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON).

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I also thank the gentleman for his great effort on behalf of our task force, overall effort to come to grips here in the House with these issues.

The gentleman is absolutely correct. The subject of human intelligence is one that we have discussed at great length and, I believe, recognize today that our ability to deal through human intelligence has been greatly limited in recent years.

I do not say this to be critical, but I think it is an objective fact, because the recent administration has put in place policies that have made it difficult, and more difficult as time has gone on, for us to collect data that we need.

We had a discussion just the other day about a related but slightly bigger issue, and that is whether or not we can detect the emergence in certain countries of nuclear capability, which relates to human intelligence as well or the lack thereof.

So certainly one of the things that we can do is to work with the CIA and other agencies to beef up our human intelligence effort, which is so necessary in being able to predict with some degree and certainty, at least in general, where these types of acts will occur.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his observations, and I think the recent nuclear tests in India and Pakistan reflect this to some degree also. We were surprised by this activity. It reminded us once again that there is no substitute for having a person in the plant or a person in the planning group or a person in a particular government agency. And especially to relate back to the tragic bombings that have just occurred, when there is a likelihood that this is State-sponsored terrorism, it is going to be more and more important for us to beef up our intelligence budget.

Finally, one last thing that has always occurred to me in the 18 years that I have been here in the House of Representatives is this: We admire and we respect our Armed Forces and the men and women who serve in them.

But in some corners in Congress, there has always been a resentment, if you will, of our intelligence agencies as if these men and women who put their lives on the line in remote places of the world where they do not come home to

ticker tape parades like our military sometimes does, as if they are something less of American servants than the people in uniform.

Actually these people, our intelligence personnel, perform an enormous service for our country, and they do it, generally speaking, in a way in which they receive very little credit for what they have done.

In the end, at the end of their career, they know what they did. One or two other people, or maybe a handful of people, may know what they have done for their country. But, as I said, they do not come home to ticker tape parades.

I think we have to adjust our attitude about the value and the patriotism of the folks who work in the intelligence services for our country. I hope we get to the bottom of what happened in Africa. I hope that it serves a warning bell to us in this House that we need to put more resources into the intelligence and the counterterrorism area.

I wonder if my friend, the gentleman from New Jersey, has any comments.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I would just quickly make one final point, and that is that acts of terrorism, we know now, are not carried out in a vacuum. They are part of an overall plan to destabilize some kind of activity. I would suggest that, in this case, Mr. Speaker, it appears that it is an activity to destabilize our overseas international operations. I think the American people ought to be aware that it is not just an act. It is a planned covert activity that is being carried out in general against our country.

CELEBRATION OF 50 YEARS OF INDIA'S INDEPENDENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, this morning I want to join with the people of India and the Indian American community as we conclude a year of celebrations in honor of the 50th year of Indian independence.

The 51st anniversary of India's independence will actually occur on August 14th of this year, when Congress is in recess. So I wanted to take this opportunity today to mark this important occasion before my colleagues and the American people in this House.

On August 14 of 1947, after years of determined and dignified struggle, the people of India finally gained their independence. That midnight hour, a vote by India's first Prime Minister, Nehru, in a stirring speech to the Parliament, marked the beginning of an inspiring effort by the people of India to establish a Republic devoted to the principles of democracy and secularism.

In the 5 decades since then, despite the challenges of sustaining economic

development while reconciling her many ethnic and religious and linguistic communities, India has stuck to the path of free and fair elections, a multiparty political system, and the orderly transfer of power from one government to a successor.

Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, India once again demonstrated its continued commitment to democratic values through its parliamentary elections in which more than 300 million people voted. The 1998 elections were but the latest example of the vibrancy of the electoral process in the world's largest democracy.

□ 1130

Mr. Speaker, while the programs and policies have changed over the years, successive Indian governments representing various parties and coalitions, have continued to build on the dream of India's first Prime Minister Nehru to move forward on the path of representative democracy and economic development.

Mr. Speaker, there is a rich tradition of shared values between the United States and India. The United States and India both proclaimed their independence from the British colonial order. India derived key aspects of her Constitution, particularly the statement of fundamental rights, from our own Bill of Rights. The Indian independence movement has strong moral support from American intellectuals, political leaders and journalists. One of our greatest American heroes, Dr. Martin Luther King, in his struggle to make the promise of American democracy a reality for all of our citizens, Dr. King derived many of his ideas of nonviolent resistance to injustice from the teachings of the father of India's independence movement, Mahatma Gandhi.

In our time, Mr. Speaker, we are seeing another exciting way in which our two societies are moving closer together, namely through the influx of immigrants from India who have made their homes in America. The Indian American community, now numbering more than 1 million, have become an important part of the ethnic mosaic in my home State of New Jersey and in communities throughout the United States. As they strive for a part of the American dream, Indian Americans continue to enrich our civic, political, business, professional and cultural life through their commitment to hard work, family values and communities. The Indian American community also serves as a human bridge between the world's two largest democracies.

Another way in which India and America continue to grow closer is through economic ties. The historic market reforms begun in India at the beginning of this decade continue to move forward, offering unparalleled opportunities for trade, investment and joint partnerships, all of which include a human dimension of friendship and cooperation, in addition to the economic benefits for both societies.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that this House will soon after the recess pass legislation I have sponsored with my colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM), which would allow the Government of India to construct a statue of Gandhi here in Washington, D.C. The legislation, which has been reported out of committee and is ready for floor action, stipulates that American taxpayers would not have to bear any costs for constructing or maintaining the memorial, but merely provides the land for the Government of India to construct the monument. The location of the monument would be adjacent to the Indian Embassy on Washington's "Embassy Row" on Massachusetts Avenue. The National Capital Memorial Commission has already given its approval to this proposal.

Washington, as we know, is a city of great monuments and memorials that help define who we as Americans are and what we as a Nation stand for, and I believe that the proposed Gandhi memorial would be a worthy addition to the landscape of our Nation's Capital.

Mr. Speaker, just a few weeks ago, we Americans celebrated the Fourth of July. For nearly 1 billion people in India, one sixth of the human race, the 14th of August holds the same significance, and I am proud to extend my congratulations to the people of India as they embark on their second half-century of independence and democracy.

Mr. Speaker, as we enter the August recess after today, the United States and India are preparing to meet and discuss peace and security in south Asia. We all know that our relations were somewhat dampened after the explosion of the nuclear bombs, the tests that occurred back in May of this year. Last week the Congressional Caucus on India and Indian Americans met with Assistant Secretary of State for South Asia, Rick Inderfurth. And Mr. Inderfurth has accompanied Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbot for talks in New Delhi. Mr. Inderfurth said that the meetings in India were positive and he believed that progress was being made in terms of improving relations. He categorized the bilateral meetings as successful "quiet diplomacy." He told the India Caucus that the United States was not demanding, but helping India take the proper steps towards international consensus on nuclear nonproliferation.

Later this month in Washington, Mr. Talbot will again meet with India's Prime Minister's representative, Mr. Jaswant Singh, to reconcile U.S. differences on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. I am confident that progress will be made at this meeting.

I am confident because earlier this week, India's Prime Minister Vajpayee told the Indian Parliament that India was close to signing the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. The Prime Minister felt that India was ready to sign, because India's national security is no longer compromised and it is not necessary to conduct further nuclear tests.